## REMARKS

Applicant has thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks in the October 11, 2007 final Office action and have amended the application to more clearly set forth aspects of the invention. This Amendment B amends claims 1, 11, 15, 29, 36, 42, 48, 54, and 60-62 and cancels claims 12, 24 and 56-57.

Claims 1-9, 11, 13-23, 25-32, 34-38, 40-44, 46-48, 52-55, and 58-62 are thus presented in the application for further examination. Reconsideration of the application as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

### Claim Objections

Claim 11 is objected to because of improper antecedent basis. The claim has been amended per the Examiner's suggestion and the objection should be withdrawn.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-9, 11-32, 34-38 and 40-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims have been amended per the Examiner's suggestion and the rejection should be withdrawn.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-9, 11-32, 34-38, 40-44, 46-50 and 52-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mastrianni (U.S. Pub. App. 2002/0116641), hereinafter "Mastrianni", in view of Kester et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,194,464), hereinafter "Kester".

The Mastrianni reference teaches client side email filtering based on message semantics. (Mastrianni, Abstract). Mastrianni teaches "scanning the attached file and file header information **for embedded content such as** file names, **URLs,** or other identifiers **that contain any objectionable phrases or words."** (Mastrianni, page 3, paragraph 34). And, if any **objection phrases or words are found in the URL,** the attachment is marked as "possible objectionable material" and forwarded to a parent or system administrator disposition. (Mastrianni, page 3, paragraph 34).

Kester teaches a system and method configured to receive the identifier (URL), and to allow or deny access to the Internet website/page associated with the identifier, using a master

14                                    MS#303277.01 (5074)

database of identifiers along with one or more categories associated with each identifier (Kester, column 1, line 53 - column 2, line 12). Specifically, Kester teaches that categorization can be based upon word analysis, adaptive learning systems, and image analysis. (Kester, column 8, lines 3-25).

In summary, the cited references relate to controlling access based on *content* analysis, not based on *category* analysis as recited by the claims. In particular, none of the above references are cited for, nor do any of these references teach or suggest (1) parsing the received electronic communication to identify **URLs within the received electronic communication**, (2) identifying the *category* assigned to <u>each</u> identified URL, and (3) routing the communication as a function of the *categories* of the identified URLs is found in the combined art as claimed and described in the present application.

Claim 1 as amended recites a system for handling an electronic communication, said system including a computer readable storage medium having instructions stored thereon, when executed by a computer processor, to perform a method:

> receiving the electronic communication;
> parsing the received electronic communication **to identify URLs <u>within</u> the received electronic communication;**
> for each identified URL, sending a request to a categorizing server system **to identify the category assigned to each identified URL,** said categorizing server system employing a URL database to cross reference the URL and maintain URL categories; and
> routing the communication as a function **of the categories of the identified URLs.**

The URL parser presents <u>each URL found in the electronic communication</u> to the tool kit, which passes the URLs to the server, which, in turn, **looks up the** *category* **in the database** and **provides the** *category* **or rating information** to the tool kit. (Specification, page 8, paragraph 33; FIG. 2). Additionally, the software includes instructions for **routing the electronic communication as a function of the** *categorized* **URLs**. (Specification, page 9, paragraph 36). For example, **if all URLs of a particular electronic communication are categorized as inappropriate,** access to the electronic communication is limited to system administrators and **the electronic communication would be routed to the system administrator to a location where the administrator could access it but where client could not access it**. (Specification, page 9, paragraph 36). As another example, if all URLs of a

15                                                    MS#303277.01 (5074)

particular electronic communication are categorized as appropriate, the electronic communication is routed to the client. (Specification, page 9, paragraph 36).

Writing for the Supreme Court, Justice Anthony Kennedy observed that a patent claim is invalid for obviousness when the invention combines familiar elements according to known methods to produce no more than predictable results. *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.* U.S., No. 04-1350, 4/30/07. However, in this rejection, neither the __elements__ of parsing and identifying nor the __result__ of routing is found in the combined art.

Furthermore, Mastrianni teaches *content* analysis by "scanning the attached file and file header information **for embedded content such as file names, URLs,** or other identifiers **that** __contain__ **any objectionable phrases or words."** (Mastrianni, page 3, paragraph 34). And, if any **objection phrases or words are found __in__ the URL,** the attachment is marked as "possible objectionable material" and forwarded to a parent or system administrator disposition. (Mastrianni, page 3, paragraph 34). Kester also teaches a system and method for *content* analysis. Kester's system and method are configured to receive the identifier (URL), and to allow or deny access to the Internet website/page associated with the identifier, using a master database of identifiers along with one or more categories associated with each identifier (Kester, column 1, line 53 - column 2, line 12). However, if combined, Mastrianni and Kester do not disclose or make obvious (1) parsing the received electronic communication to identify **URLs within the received electronic communication,** (2) identifying the *category* assigned to __each__ identified **URL,** and (3) **routing the communication as a function of the** *categories* **of the identified URLs** as claimed and described in the present application.

For example, assume a web page (e.g. electronic communication) is associated with an URL (the location of the web page), and this web page contains numerous other links (embedded URLs). In a first scenario, assume one of the embedded URLs contains the phrase "phone sex", but the web page associated with this embedded URL is not inappropriate because it is a site dedicated to preventing advertising of phone sex services during family TV viewing hours. In this first scenario, the combination of Mastrianni/Kester would block the original web page (e.g., the web page containing the embedded URL) because the *content* "phone sex" was included in the embedded URL. (Mastrianni, page 3, paragraph 40). In contrast, the present invention would send the embedded URL to the *categorizing* server system. The categorizing server system would look up the embedded URL and indicate that the page associated with the

embedded URL was appropriate, thus *access* to the original web page would based on its *category*, not its *content*, so that access not be blocked.

In a second scenario, assume all of the embedded URLs of the original web page do contain any objectionable words or phrases and the original web page does not contain any objectionable words or phrases. However, one of the embedded URLs of the page is a link to a web page containing objectionable material. In this second scenario, the combination of Mastrianni/Kester would not block the original web page (e.g., the web page containing the embedded URL). The teaching of Mastrianni would not block the page because none of the URLs contain objectionable words and phrases. Furthermore the teaching of Kester would not block the requested web page because original web page does not contain any objectionable material and would not be in an inappropriate category. (Kester, column 5, lines 26-38; column 8, lines 3-25). In contrast, the present invention would block web page. The categorizing server system would look up the embedded URL. The categorizing server system will indicate that the page associated with the embedded URL was inappropriate, and thus access to the original web page would be blocked.

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit that independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited art. Claims 2-9, 11, 13 and 14 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 15, 29, 36, 42, 48, 54, 60, 61, and 62 have been similarly amended as claim 1 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

For example, claim 15 recites "categorizing the identified URLs by looking up the category of each identified URL via a categorizing server system;" claim 29 recites "designating based on the rating certain of the identified URLs as inappropriate or assigning based on the rating a number to each identified URL based on its inappropriateness"; claim 36 recites "designating based on the rating certain of the identified URLs as inappropriate or assigning based on the rating a number to each identified URL based on its inappropriateness"; claim 42 recites "instructions for categorizing the stored electronic communications based on the URLs therein by looking up the category of each identified URL via a categorizing server system, said categorizing server system employing a URL database to cross reference the URL and to maintain URL categories"; claim 48 recites "for each identified URL, sending a request to a categorizing server system to identify the category assigned to each identified URL, said categorizing server system employing a URL database to cross reference the URL and to

MS#303277.01 (5074)

17

maintain URL categories"; claim 54 recites "instructions for periodically rating the web pages based on categories of the URLs therein, said categories of the URLs identified by a categorizing server system employing a URL database to cross reference the URL and maintain URL categories"; claim 60 recites "for each identified URL, sending a request to a categorizing server system to identify the category assigned to each of the identified URLs by looking up the category of each identified URL via a categorizing server system, said categorizing server system employing a URL database to cross reference the URL and maintain URL categories"; claim 61 recites "for each identified URL, sending a request to a categorizing server system to identify the category of the identified URLs, said categorizing server system employing a URL database to cross reference the URL and maintain URL categories"; and claim 62 recites "rating the electronic communication based on the identified categories of the identified URLs based on the identified categories of the identified URLs".

Claims 16-23, 25-28, 30-32, 34-35, 37-38, 40-41, 43-44, 46-47, 52-53, 55 and 58-59 depend from claims 15, 29, 36, 42, 48, and 54, respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 15, 29, 36, 42, 48, and 54.

## CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein Applicant thus respectfully submit that claims 1-9, 11, 13-23, 25-32, 34-38, 40-44, 46-48, 52-55, and 58-62 as presented are in condition for allowance and respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

Although the prior art made of record and not relied upon may be considered pertinent to the disclosure, none of these references anticipates or makes obvious the recited aspects of the invention. The fact that Applicant may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicant's agreement therewith.

Applicant wishes to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the application to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance.

18                                    MS#303277.01 (5074)

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

*Frank R Agovino*

Frank R. Agovino, Reg. No. 27,416
SENNIGER POWERS
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400

FRA/BAW/cjl